



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/607,791	02/27/96	GOODHILL	P06-34023

21M1/0806
CRAIG S SUMMERS
PRETTY SCHROEDER BRUEGGEMANN & CLARK
44 SOUTH FLOWER STREET SUITE 2000
LOS ANGELES CA 90071

MILLER EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2101	2

DATE MAILED:

08/06/96

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/607,791

Applicant(s)
Goodhill

Examiner
Matthew Miller

Group Art Unit
2101



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 27, 1996

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1111

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazen et al in view of Kajimoto et al.

Frazen et al discloses recording images from a motion picture onto a "recording means well known in the art" (col. 10 lines 25-26) of which high definition video at any particular number of horizontal lines is one. Frazen doesn't disclose transferring images into digital format. Kajimoto et al discloses non-linear editing and transferring images into digital format. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention by one skilled in the art to combine the video with the non-linear editing. One would have been motivated to do so to increase the resolution of video used for editing purposes to more closely simulate the motion picture.

3. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazen et al and Kajimoto et al as applied to claims 1-7 above, and further in view of Washino et al.

Frazen et al and Kajimoto et al disclose the claimed invention but do not disclose changing aspect ratios. As is well known in the art Washino et al discloses changing aspect ratios electronically. It is well known in the art to use an anamorphic lens to change aspect ratios.

Art Unit: 1111

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine aspect ratio changing with Frazen et al and Kajimoto et al. One would have been motivated to do so to maintain standard aspect ratios.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Matt Miller at telephone number (703) 308-7621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-34[31,32]. Any inquiry of a general nature or related to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.


SAFET METJAHIC
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2000